

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2, 7, and 11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Therefore, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, and 12-13 are pending, of which claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 are independent.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Jilk et al. (US Pat-7,155,400).

Claims 2, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jilk et al.

Claim 3, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jilk et al. in view of Brodersen et al. (US Pat-6,850,895).

The above rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

**Drawings**

The Office Action does not indicate whether the drawings of record are acceptable. Absent any further indication otherwise from the USPTO, it is assumed that the drawings of record are acceptable.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that worker information is related to a worker to be registered for each work item with respect to the work. Independent claim 5 has been amended to clarify that the work support method is to be implemented in a work support apparatus. Independent claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the work support apparatus comprises a skill information storage unit, a work item information storage unit, a work information storage unit, a worker extracting unit and a storing unit.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Jilk et al.

**Independent claims 1, 5, 6, and 10**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other things, "storing skill information of workers and information related to an end date of a training which is being received by each worker in a skill information storage unit" (underlined emphasis added). Claims 5, 6 and 10 have been amended in a manner similar to

independent claim 1. Support for these features may be found in, for example, original claim 2.

As acknowledged in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 on page 4 of the Office Action, Jilk et al. does not disclose, among other things, storing information related to an end date of a training which is being received by each worker. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 and respective dependent claims thereof under 35 U.S.C. 102 is moot in view of the aforementioned claim amendments.

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 5, 6, and 10) has been amended, in part, to further recite, "extracting, with respect to each work item stored in the work item information storage unit in response to a work order, worker information related to a worker having a skill capable of performing each work item, based on the skill information of workers stored in the skill information storage unit, and re-extracting, upon no worker information is extractable for a work item, worker information related to a worker who will have a skill capable of performing said work item by a time when said work item of the work order is generated, based on the information related to the end date of the training stored in the skill information storage unit" (underlined emphasis added). Support for these features may be found in, for example, the original disclosure on page 36, line 22 to page 37, line 23 of the specification, FIG. 23 (steps 5010 and 5011).

The Office Action on page 5 relies upon Jilk et al. and further asserts that, "[it] is old and well known in the art to store a completion date of training, such as a resume containing a graduation date (i.e., a completion date) for a degree. It would

have been obvious...to include [in Jilk et al.] an end date for a training in order to more accurately represent that a user has completed a training, thus allowing the system to match only qualified candidates with jobs.” However, it is respectfully submitted that Jilk et al. neither discloses nor makes obvious a further “re-extracting, upon no worker information is extractable for a work item, worker information related to a worker who will have a skill capable of performing said work item by a time when said work item of the work order is generated, based on the information related to the end date of the training stored in the skill information storage unit.”

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 5, 6, 10, and respective dependent claims thereof are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Jilk et al. Therefore, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, and 12-13 are allowable over the references of record.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jilk et al. The rejection of these claims are moot in view of the cancelation of these claims in the foregoing amendments.

Claim 3, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jilk et al. in view of Brodersen et al. (US Pat-6,850,895).

It is respectfully submitted that, for at least the reasons set forth earlier with regard to claims 1, 5, 6, 10, their dependent claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are neither

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 02-53493  
App. Ser. No.: 10/722,369

anticipated nor made obvious by Jilk et al. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Brodersen et al. does not teach or suggest at least the amended features in claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 (and thus their respective dependent claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 13).

Accordingly, as noted above, claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are also allowable over the references of record.

**Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 50-4610.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 11, 2008

By /Tiep Nguyen/  
Tiep H. Nguyen  
Registration No.: 44,465

FUJITSU PATENT CENTER  
PTO Customer No.: 79326